



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,779	10/13/1999	FRANCO P. PREPARATA	BUV-003.01	6623

28120 7590 01/27/2003

ROPES & GRAY
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110-2624

EXAMINER

CLOW, LORI A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003

291

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/416,779

Applicant(s)

PREPARATA ET AL.

Examiner

Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-8,10-12 and 20-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-8,10-12 and 20-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed 12 November 2002, have been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 20-29 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

In the interview dated 29 October 2002, the attorney of record, John Quisel, stated that the claims were intended to represent a set of probes that each contained separate instances of universal and designate nucleotides, as in the following pattern:

XXXXXXXXX
UUUUUUUU
UUUUUUUU
UUUUUUUU etc...

However, the interpretation based upon the details in the specification and the claim language would be the following pattern:

Art Unit: 1631

XXUXUXUX

Applicants have reproduced a portion of the specification as follows in support of their argument:

“A set of gapped probes, as the term is used herein, refers to a collection of probes having the same generic probe sequence, e.g., at least ten instances of the generic probe sequence. A generic probe sequence describes a pattern of designate and universal nucleotides, e.g., XXXXUUXUXX. An instance of a generic probe sequence of designate and universal nucleotides which conforms to the pattern of the generic probe sequence, e.g., TCTAUUGUCG and GTATUUCUAG are instances of the generic probe sequence XXXXUUXUXX.”

However, this portion of the specification fails support the arguments made in the telephone interview that centered around the fact that the instances of designate and universal primers in the set are separate instances, as illustrated above. Thus, the specification lacks written description such that it does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 4 and 6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loakes et al. (1995). These claims remain directed to oligonucleotide sets of probes, wherein the probes a plurality of instances of universal nucleotides and designate nucleotides in iterative patterns. As described previously, Loakes et al. (Nucleic Acids Research (1995) vol. 23; pages 2361-2366) discloses oligonucleotides 3-nitropyrrole and 5-nitroindole as useful in hybridization. Loakes et al. further describe sets of oligonucleotides in various iterative patterns (Table 1). Loakes et al. disclose the particular embodiments of claims 4 and 6 in that a first string of universal nucleotides is followed by a first segment of designate nucleotides and a second string of universal primers is followed by a second set of designate nucleotides. Applicant has repeatedly insisted that Loakes et al. does not anticipate claims 4 and 6 because Loakes is directed to Sanger sequencing and not to sequencing by hybridization. However, there is nothing in the amended claim language to suggest that claims 4 and 6 are meant for sequencing by hybridization and thus still read on traditional sequencing methods as well as PCR.

Inquiries

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242, or (703) 308-4028.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori A. Clow, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

Art Unit: 1631

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524, or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


MARY K. ZEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER



January 24, 2003

Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit 1631

